

### **REMARKS**

Claims 64-83 are pending. Claims 64-83 are amended.

#### **I. Formal Matters**

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Office Action indicates that the drawings filed on February 21, 2008 are accepted. Also, Applicant is pleased that the claim of priority is acknowledged.

#### **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 82 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit amended claims 82 and 83 and request the Examiner's reconsideration.

#### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 64, 66-75, 77-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sevanto *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,011, hereinafter "Sevanto"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 64, 71, 74, and 75 are amended to clarify with respect to the first and second terminal nodes. Specifically, the first terminal node is addressable by a global source address and the second terminal node is addressable by an ad hoc destination address. In other words, the subject invention relates to communication between general networks and an ad hoc network.

Applicants submit that Sevanto does not teach or suggest methods or apparatus relating to ad hoc networks at all. Instead, Sevanto is directed to tunnelling for a GPRS communication system. Such tunnelling is not suitable for an ad hoc network, but rather an established tunnel at a GGSN/WAP-GW node.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 64, 71, 74, and 75 are not anticipated by Sevanto and request the withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the Examiner's reconsideration.

#### **IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 65, 76, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savanto and further in view of Skog *et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0028636, hereinafter “Skog”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Further to the discussion above, Applicants respectfully submit that Skog also does not teach or suggest method or apparatus relating to ad hoc networks. In particular, Skog aims at providing a mechanism for use of IP addresses to establish an association between an MSISDN number and a particular IP address (please see section [0008] on page 1).

Therefore, Skog also does not teach or suggest that the first terminal node is addressable by a global source address and the second terminal node is addressable by an ad hoc destination address, and therefore cannot cure Sevanto’s defects with respect to the independent claims.

Furthermore, Skog’s RADIUS accounting does not teach an acknowledgement during transfer of information or that the billing is dependent upon receipt of acknowledgement of transmission success.

Finally, Sevanto teaches away from using IP addresses because IP addresses are a scarce resource (column 2, lines 29-38).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 65, 76, and 83 are patentable over the combination of Sevanto and Skog, and request withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and the Examiner’s reconsideration.

#### **V. Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any outstanding issue could be resolved through a telephone interview, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, the Examiner is authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. 141449.

App. No.: 10/569,309  
Page 10 of 10  
Dated: August 20, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 109621-64923

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 21125

By John J. Penny, Jr.

John J. Penny, Jr.

Registration No.: 36,984

Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP

World Trade Center West

155 Seaport Boulevard

Boston, MA 02210

(617) 429-2566

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant